## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 11 and 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Roettger. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Roettger in view of Fischer.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 11 and 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Roettger. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Roettger in view of Fischer.

Claim 1 recites "the expansion segment being movable so as to be non-evenly depressible over a width of the expansion segment" as described for example in the specification at page 2, lines 19 to 22 and page 5, line 23 to page 6, line 1.

The expansion segment 16 is shown for example in Fig. 3, and is shown how it is non-depressible over a width, since springs 61, 62, 63 for example can compress different amounts. This if a jam for example is experienced over spring 61, spring 61 can compress more so that expansion segment 16 tilts, i.e. non-evenly depresses over the width.

Roettger on the other hand is not non-evenly depressible at all over its width. All of the segments 18 change their diameter at a same rate, as described at col. 3, line 14:

> The collection-and-folding blade cylinder 2 carries part-circular segments 18 located at its circumference, which are secured to a segment carrier 19. The segment carrier 19 is secured in the interior of the base body 10 by a positioning spindle 20 which is eccentrically rotationally retained in the base body and passes through the segment carrier 19. The positioning spindle 20 is secured to a gear 21, for rotation therewith, located outside of the base body, the gear 21 transmitting positioning movement to increase or decrease the diameter of the collection-and-folding cylinder 2.

Segments 18 thus all change their diameter at a same rate due to spindle 20. Thus there is no way for any "expansion segment" of Roettger to be movable so as to be non-evenly depressible over a width. In other words segments 18 cannot tilt.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

With further respect to claims 6 to 10, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art to place foam between two parts movable to one another in a folding cylinder as claimed. It is respectfully submitted that foam pieces with friction reducing coatings for use with such a device is not known in the art, not has any evidence been submitted to so support this assertion. In particular, the assertion of using foam pieces to "reduce friction" is not understood.

With further respect to claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art would not have placed springs in the apparatus of Roettger as it has a positioning spindle 20 which must be fixed in the radial distance with respect to parts 18 and 19, as it is an eccentric. (See Roettger at col. 4, lines 20 to 34). Springs would destroy this eccentric function.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 5 to 10 for these reasons as well is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 14, claim 14 recites a folding cylinder comprising:

a frame having a work-side support and a gear-side support;

at least one expansion segment for providing an effective diameter of the cylinder, the expansion segment being located between the work-side support and the gear-side support and spaced apart from at least one of the work-side support and the gear-side support;

a foam piece having at least one friction-reducing surface in a space between the expansion segment and the at least one of the gear-side and work-side supports; and

an actuating device for contacting the at least one expansion segment and setting the effective diameter.

No prior art cited teaches or shows "a foam piece having at least one friction-reducing surface in a space between the expansion segment and the at least one of the gear-side and work-side supports."

It is not understood where in the prior art foam pieces with friction reducing coatings, and how one of skill in the art would be motivated to provide such foam pieces into the Roettger device. It is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art would not have placed such a foam piece in the Roettger device.

Claim 18 similarly recites "a first foam piece having at least one friction-reducing surface in a space between the expansion segment and the gear-side support" and "a second foam piece

having at least one friction-reducing surface in a space between the expansion segment and the work-side support".

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 14, its dependent claims 15 to 17, and claim 18 is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____

William C. Gehris
Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940